**Additional Feedback from participants at meeting conducted to share SV Documentation Project Evaluation Report on 21 October, 2012.**

The main purpose of the meeting was to share evaluation findings of Sexual violence documentation among its implementing partners and relevant stakeholders. The specific objectives were to share project evaluation findings, recommendations and lessons learnt and to seek feedback on the report from the participants.

The meeting was organized on behalf of UNFPA and UNICEF. There were about 25 participants mostly representing project implementing partners and related government partners and UN agencies. SV Evaluation was shared by Dr. Yagya Bahadur Karki (Team leader, PHD group). Project Evaluation presentation focused on objective, scope, methodology, data analysis, ethical consideration, evaluation findings and recommendations. Also findings were shared on evaluation criteria used by UN.

**Feedback on the SV Project Evaluation Report from the participants**

* Representative of UN Peace Fund Nepal said that although the project was on SGBV components of peace building, evaluation of strength and weakness related to peace building impact was not evaluated in the report. UN Peace Fund Nepal asked the evaluation team to explore how the project could have ensure national ownership and stressed the need to link achievement and recommendation with peace building and not just health related recommendations as mentioned in the report.
* Representative from National Women Commission (NWC) said that the project approach and implementation isimpressive and innovative as the RH camp was used as an entry point for identifying victims of SGBV. NWC suggested to start such kind of projects on a wider scale.
* In evaluation report presentation, it was mentioned that some district health officers were not satisfied as some of the camps were conducted not in the community they recommended. FEEDBACK-the information that project withheld was documentation for TRC purpose, so the project sites were selected based on where the conflict had taken place and not where more survivor of UP lives.
* RH camp achievement was shown as 36,471(175%). FEEDBACK- The target of RH services was 20,000 during the project period and target achieved was 27525 (72% more).
* Evaluator said that psychosocial counselling and support rated satisfactory. FEEDBACK: evaluation team was requested to reflect on the table (3.19) of the report they provided, related to psychosocial counseling. It says that the 81.7 % respondents who got psycho-social service/counseling at RH camp, said camp service was good and 9.6% said camp service was very good. (see Evaluation Report, Annex 4, Table 3.19)
* It was clarified that 70 cases were identified based on documented cases and cases identified through legal counseling together.
* Regarding external referral mechanism, participants shared that external referral mechanism was done not only for legal and psychosocial support but also for livelihood and specialized psychosocial services.
* Evaluator shared that Indirect estimate of coverage of SGBV in 14 districts is only 11%. Feedback: Coverage of SGBV needs to be based on 2 VDC where RH camp was held and should not be based on entire district.
* Participants said that frequent turnover of project staffs in UNFPA and UNICEF also delayed decision making.
* Presenter shared that stakeholders noted that the timing of programme activities was not appropriate. FEEDBACK-it is good to have such projects immediately after the conflict but it never late to explore their experience and support them with needed services.
* Presenter shared that some national level NGOs felt that selection of focus VDCs should have been done differently; mapping was not done in consultation with district level stakeholders. FEEDBACK: VDC selected in consultation with stakeholders by project team members before going for RH camp and report was prepared accordingly. Also in 2 follow up camps, different camp locations were chosen because of security reasons.
* Participants commented that in specific recommendations was expected on how to deal with conflict related SV and domestic violence
* Evaluator shared that men were not directly involved in the project activities but it is important to include men and sensitize them on SGBV, RH to reinforce their positive response, attitude to victims of SV. FEEDBACK-men were strategically not given services (target group were women/girls) and were discouraged to enter RH camp to ensure that SV survivors do not hesitate to seek services and confidentiality can be maintained. Some men were involved in camp management committee to ensure smooth camp activities.